

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

SHIRLEY DIMPS

Plaintiff,

-against-

NEW YORK STATE DEPARTMENT OF
CORRECTIONS AND COMMUNITY
SUPERVISION,

Defendant.

USDC SDNY
DOCUMENT
ELECTRONICALLY FILED
DOC #:
DATE FILED: 6/2/2025

No. 17 CIV 8806 (NSR)

ORDER

NELSON S. ROMÁN, United States District Judge:

By Opinion dated April 3, 2024, this Court dismissed *pro se* Plaintiff's hostile work environment and retaliation claims, as asserted in her Second Amended Complaint, which were brought under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C. § 2000e, et seq. (ECF No. 126.) Plaintiff now moves pursuant to Fed. Rul. Civ. Pro. 59 for reconsideration. (ECF No. 160.) For the following reason(s), the motion is DENIED.

A motion for reconsideration is "an extraordinary remedy to be employed sparingly in the interests of finality and conservation of scarce judicial resources." *In re Initial Public Offering Sec. Litig.*, 399 F.Supp.2d 298, 300 (S.D.N.Y.2005) (internal citation and quotation omitted), *aff'd sub nom.* Furthermore, "[m]otions for reconsideration are properly granted only if there is a showing of: (1) an intervening change in controlling law; (2) the availability of new evidence or (3) a need to correct a clear error or prevent manifest injustice." *Drapkin v. Mafco Consol. Grp., Inc.*, 818 F. Supp. 2d 678 (S.D.N.Y. 2011).

Here, *pro se* Plaintiff offers neither any factual averments nor arguments as to any of the three possible bases for the Court to grant *pro se* Plaintiff's motion. *Pro se* Plaintiff's motion merely

states that the Court “violated the MANDATE from the Court of Appeals” and requests that her hostile work environment and retaliation claims brought under Title VII be “reopened.” (Mot. p. 8.) Accordingly, *pro se* Plaintiff’s motion for reconsideration is DENIED without prejudice. If *pro se* Plaintiff wishes, *pro se* Plaintiff may seek leave of Court to file a motion for reconsideration addressing the aforementioned factors.

The Clerk of Court is kindly directed terminate the motion at ECF No. 160, to mail a copy of this Order to *pro se* Plaintiff at the address listed on ECF and to show service on the docket,

Dated: June 2, 2025
White Plains, New York

SO ORDERED:

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read 'Nelson S. Román', is written over a light blue horizontal line.

NELSON S. ROMÁN
United States District Judge